Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/751,946	CURATOLO, SUSANA
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mark H. Paschall	3742
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>041</u>	
(1) Mark H. Paschall.	(3)	
(2) <u>Mr. Palan</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 18 November 2005	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representativė)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: All		
Claims discussed: 1-22		
Prior art documents discussed: Ware and Miyzaki		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. T of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summation 	he examiner will provide a writte e record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
MIBR		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant pointed out that the creation of a beneficial electron vortex in the envelope is influenced by the tapered shape of the envelope or substance therein, and the prior art of record does not teach use of a tapered shape of the envelope, as proposed in the amended claims. Claims would be allowable over the prior art of record, as proposed. Update search for this feature wil be made..